Case 1:24-cv-06897-PAE-HJR Document 21

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BMO Bank N.A.,

Plaintiff,

-v-

Prateek Gattani,

Defendant.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: ___
DATE FILED: __1/16/2025

SCHEDULING ORDER FOR DAMAGES INQUEST

24-CV-6897 (PAE) (HJR)

HENRY J. RICARDO, United States Magistrate Judge.

On January 10, 2025, Judge Engelmayer granted a default judgment against defendant Prateek Gattani. ECF No. 19. That same day, this case was referred to me to conduct an inquest into damages. ECF No. 20.

"[E]ven when the defendant defaults and is not present to object, damages must be based on admissible evidence." Am. Jewish Comm. v. Berman, No. 15-CV-5983 (LAK) (JLC), 2016 WL 3365313, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. June 15, 2016) (quoting House v. Kent Worldwide Mach. Works, Inc., 359 F. App'x 206, 207 (2d Cir. 2010)) (citations omitted), adopted by 2016 WL 4532201 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 29, 2016). In the context of a default, allegations in a pleading pertaining to damages are not deemed admitted. Nat'l Photo Grp., LLC v. Bigstar Entm't, Inc., No. 13-CV-5467 (VSB) (JLC), 2014 WL 1396543, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 11, 2014) (citing Finkel v. Romanowicz, 577 F.3d 79, 84 (2d Cir. 2009)), adopted by 2014 WL 5051275 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 8, 2014). Rather, "a plaintiff must submit sufficient evidence, in the form of detailed affidavits and other documentary materials to enable the district

court to 'establish damages with reasonable certainty." *Id.* (quoting *Transatlantic Marine Claims Agency, Inc. v. Ace Shipping Corp.*, 109 F.3d 105, 111 (2d Cir. 1997)) (internal citations omitted); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b)(2).

Moreover, where a plaintiff's filings raise questions as to whether a district court may permissibly exercise personal jurisdiction over a non-appearing defendant, the court may consider *sua sponte* whether the plaintiff has set forth facts justifying the assertion of personal jurisdiction. *Hood v. Ascent Med. Corp.*, No. 13-CV-0628 (RWS) (DF), 2016 WL 1366920, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 3, 2016), adopted by 2016 WL 3453656 (S.D.N.Y. June 20, 2016), aff'd, 691 F. App'x 8 (2d Cir. 2017). See generally Sinoying Logistics Pte Ltd. v. Yi Da Xin Trading Corp., 619 F.3d 207, 213 (2d Cir. 2010) ("Because personal jurisdiction can be waived by a party, a district court should *not* raise personal jurisdiction *sua sponte* when a defendant has appeared and consented . . . to the jurisdiction of the court. But when a defendant declines to appear, . . . before a court grants a motion for default judgment, it may first assure itself that it has personal jurisdiction over the defendant.") (internal citations omitted).

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff shall serve defendant Gattani and file Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law concerning all injunctive relief, damages, and any other monetary relief permitted under the entry of default judgment no later than **March** 17, 2025. Plaintiff shall include with such service a copy of this Order. The submission shall contain a concluding paragraph that succinctly summarizes what

damage amount (or other monetary relief) is being sought, including the exact dollar amount. Plaintiff may also rely on its prior submissions in lieu of Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law but must advise the Court that it is doing so by March 17, 2025.

2. Plaintiff's Proposed Findings of Fact should specifically tie the proposed damages figures to the legal claims on which liability has been established; should demonstrate how plaintiff has arrived at the proposed damages figures; and should be supported by one or more affidavits, which may attach any documentary evidence establishing the proposed damages. Each Proposed Finding of Fact shall be followed by a citation to the paragraphs of the affidavits and or page of documentary evidence that supports each such Proposed Finding. To the extent the Proposed Findings contain any allegations regarding liability, the Proposed Findings should cite to the appropriate paragraph of the complaint.

Any request for attorneys' fees must be supported by contemporaneous time records showing, for each attorney, the date of service, the hours expended, and the nature of the work performed. Counsel should file an affidavit providing the number of years each attorney has been admitted to the bar and their hourly rate. Counsel should also include charts related to any fees that they are seeking, in terms of hours and number of attorneys, if appropriate. Any spreadsheet calculations of attorney's fees should also be provided in Microsoft Excel format to the Court via email to RicardoNYSDChambers@nysd.uscourts.gov. The Conclusions of Law shall include a paragraph or paragraphs setting forth the legal

basis for any requested award of attorney's fees including, if applicable, why the number of attorneys involved are entitled to fees. Finally, counsel should provide documentary evidence justifying an award of costs.

In lieu of conclusions of law, plaintiff may submit a memorandum of law setting forth the legal principles applicable to plaintiff's claim or claims for damages (including but not limited to the legal basis for any claim for interest or attorneys' fees). Plaintiff's papers must include an affidavit from someone with personal knowledge, setting forth the facts which establish liability, the proposed damages amount, and facts which establish that the Court has both personal jurisdiction over the defendants, and jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Defendant Gattani shall send to plaintiff's counsel and file with the Court their response, if any, to plaintiff's submissions no later than **April 7, 2025.**

3. The Court hereby notifies the parties that it may conduct this inquest based solely upon the written submissions of the parties. See Bricklayers & Allied Craftworkers Local 2, Albany, N.Y. Pension Fund v. Moulton Masonry & Const., LLC, 779 F.3d 182, 189 (2d Cir. 2015) (quoting Action S.A. v. Marc Rich & Co., 951 F.2d 504, 508 (2d Cir. 1991)); Cement & Concrete Workers Dist. Council Welfare Fund, Pension Fund, Annuity Fund, Educ. & Training Fund & Other Funds v. Metro Found. Contractors Inc., 699 F.3d 230, 234 (2d Cir. 2012) (citation omitted). To the extent that any party seeks an evidentiary hearing on the issue of damages, such party must set forth in its submission the reason why the inquest should not be conducted based upon the written submissions alone, including a description of

what witnesses would be called to testify at a hearing and the nature of the evidence that would be submitted.

4. A courtesy copy of any document filed with the Court shall be sent or delivered to the undersigned.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 16, 2025 New York, New York

Henry J. Ricardo

United States Magistrate Judge